



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,999	01/11/2005	Taisei Matsumoto	TIP-04-1329	7280

35811 7590 05/18/2006

IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP  
1650 MARKET ST  
SUITE 4900  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
----------

BOYKIN, TERRESSA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/517,999

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Terressa M. Boykin

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/15/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments filed 3-9-06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' claim 1, 2 and 3 etc. remain so broadly set forth that the claim continues to be interpreted by the Examiner as anticipated by the references while remaining within the scope of the specification. It should be noted that in order to prosecute the case resourcefully and expediently while giving the applicants the best possible search, it is imperative and practical for the applicants to clarify how the composition is arranged/incorporated/formed or structured therein. Without such clarity of structure, the art of record remains within the scope of the present claims and the applicants arguments although understood and appreciated are moot on those basis.

Any properties or characteristics inherent in the prior art, e.g. molecular weight segment although unobserved or detected by the reference, would still anticipate the claimed invention. Note In re Swinehart, 169 USPQ 226. "It is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered...property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art".

**It would be beneficial for the applicants to use language from the specification to further specify the claimed language without, of course, unfairly limiting applicants intended invention.**

Art Unit: 1711

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

**Claims 1-15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 8253665 see abstract and translation provided; or EP 980894 see abstract and pages 2-5.**

**JP 8253665** discloses an antistatic polylactate composition (I) comprises: (A) polymer mainly composed of lactate unit; and (B) block copolymer(s) composed of: (B1) polyalkylene ether block(s); and (B2) polylactate block(s); where (B)/(I) = 0.3-50 wt. %.

Specifically, this composition is a mixture composed of (A) a polymer mainly containing lactic acid [preferably, a polylactic acid of a copolymer containing a lactic acid-derived component of  $\geq 50$ wt.% in the polymer] and (B) a block copolymer composed of (i) a polyalkylene ether and (ii) a polylactic acid, wherein the weight ratio of the component B is 0.3-50wt.%, preferably 0.5-30wt.%. Further, the component (i) is preferably at least the one selected from a polyethylene glycol, a polypropylene glycol and their copolymer, and the weight ratio of the component (i) is preferably 70-95wt.% in the component B. Furthermore, the component B preferably has a volume resistivity of  $\leq 1 \times 10^{10} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$  and a molecular weight of  $\geq 10000$ .

Moldings of composition (I) include fibers, fabrics, knits, nonwoven fabrics, papers, nets, ropes, films, sheets, plates, rods, tubes, and containers.

Note that the composition (I) gives moldings with good antistatic properties, improved flexibility, impact resistance, good appearance and transparency.

**EP 980894** discloses a polylactic acid-based resin composition composed of a high molecular ingredient (A) comprising polylactic acid (a1) and an aliphatic polyester (B), and a film, particularly an inflation film, prepared from the resin composition. The film comprising the polylactic acid-based resin composition of the invention is biodegradable and excellent in flexibility and resistance to blocking of film and bleeding-out of plasticizer, has no anisotropy in tear strength, and can be suitably used for an agricultural multi-film and garbage bag. When the film of the invention is used for food wrapping, the film prevents fungus growth and contamination of color or odor, and thus can be suitably used.

**Claims 1 -17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102( b) as being anticipated by US 6114495 see abstract and cols. 1-5.**

**US 6114495** discloses a polylactide polymer composition of the invention can include additional components or additives in addition to the above-described stabilizing agents. These additional components include plasticizers, nucleating agents, fillers, surface treatments, surfactants, pigments, catalysts, finishing oils, lubricants, rheology modifiers, crystallinity modifiers, and antioxidants.

For most polylactide polymer compositions, it is believed that the glass transition temperature can be lowered to desirable levels by adding a plasticizer component to provide a concentration of about 0.5 to 20 percent by weight plasticizer, based on the weight of the polymer composition. Generally, a sufficient amount of plasticizer should be incorporated to provide a desired reduction in T.sub.g. It is believed that the plasticizer level should be above at least 1 percent by weight, and more preferably above at least 2 percent by weight, to provide sufficient flexibility and softness. Accordingly, the plasticizer should be included to provide a concentration level of about 1 to 10 percent by weight.

The reference acknowledges that in general, many biodegradable polymers such as non-plasticized polylactic acid polymers are generally too brittle for use as single layer flexible films and/or sheets. Their T.sub.g is generally above 50.degree. C., and it has been observed that they provide a film or sheet having low impact resistance and tear resistance. Tear resistance of a typical polylactide film having a T.sub.g above 50.degree. C. is less than about 6 gmf /mil. Other biodegradable polymers, including certain aliphatic polyesters, exhibit poor tear strength. These physical properties render films or sheets prepared therefrom poor candidates for use as bags or wrappers. Articles such as trash bags, grocery bags, food wrappings, and the like should be flexible and resistant to tearing and puncturing.

The reference has discovered that by lowering the glass transition temperature (T.sub.g) of biodegradable polymers to about 20.degree. C. or less, it is possible to provide a film or sheet having improved flexibility and tear and puncture resistance. More preferably, it is desirable to lower the T.sub.g to below about 5.degree. C., and more preferably below about minus 10.degree. C. These glass transition temperature should be below the temperature at which the polymer is used. When the biodegradable polymer is a lactic acid residue containing polymer, a preferred method for lowering the glass transition temperature (T.sub.g) is by adding plasticizer thereto. Plasticizer can be added to a polylactide polymer to lower the glass transition temperature (T.sub.g) from 60.degree. C., without plasticizer, to 19.degree. C. at a level of 20 percent, by weight, plasticizer.

Art Unit: 1711

**Claims 1 -17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102( b) as being anticipated by US 5849401 see abstract and cols. 1-4 and claims.**

**US 5849401** discloses a compostable multilayer film includes a core layer having a first surface and a second surface, a first blocking reducing layer covering the first surface of the core layer, and a second blocking reducing core layer comprises a lactic acid residue-containing polymer having a glass transition temperature (T<sub>g</sub>) below 20.degree. C. The first and second blocking reducing layers comprise a semicrystalline aliphatic polyester. The hydrolyzable polymer and have a T<sub>sub.g</sub> above about 50.degree. C. The multilayer structure can be used for preparing bags and wrappers.

Each of the references discloses a poly lactic acid polymer having good stretchability, which may be used for package wrapping as claimed by applicants. Any properties or characteristics inherent in the prior art, e.g. tensile modulus, heat resistance, film haze or adhesion, although unobserved or detected by the reference, would still anticipate the claimed invention. Note In re Swinehart, 169 USPQ 226. "It is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered...property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art". Since the disclosed molecular weights are expressed differently and thus may be distinct from those claimed, it is incumbent upon applicant(s) to establish that they are in fact different and whether such difference is unobvious. In view of the above, there appears to be no significant difference between the reference(s) and that, which is claimed by applicant(s). Any differences not specifically mentioned appear to be conventional. Consequently, the claimed invention cannot be deemed as novel and accordingly is unpatentable.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 07205278 see abstract and claims.**

**JP 07205278** discloses a film having practical strength from a polylactic acid polymer having biodegradable properties. A non-stretched sheet of a polylactic acid polymer is

Art Unit: 1711

longitudinally stretched at stretching temp. of 50-90°C within a stretching magnification of 1.5-5 times so that the degree (Anisotropy) of in-plane orientation becomes a range of  $3.0 \times 10^{-3}$ - $30 \times 10^{-3}$  and subsequently laterally stretched at stretching temp. of 50-80°C within a stretching magnification range of 1.5-5 times to produce a sequential biaxially stretched film. After biaxial stretching, if the biaxially stretched film is heat-treated within a temp. range of 70°C-(m.p. of polymer), the thermal dimensional stability thereof is enhanced. By this constitution, the brittleness of the film is improved and stretching processing can be stably performed.

Thus, the reference discloses a stretched film polylactic acid polymer as claimed by applicants except for specifically stating that the film may be used for packaging wrap. However, the characteristics disclosed, i.e. stretching, strength etc. would be advantageous for the use for wrapping an object. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the film as a packaging wrap since a film "inherently" covers an object and the film's characteristics would advantageously lend itself as a wrap.

Consequently, the claimed invention cannot be deemed as unobvious and accordingly is unpatentable.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1711

### **Correspondence**

Please note that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov) <<http://www.uspto.gov>>), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants may be referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <<http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html>> or 1-866-217-9197.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Terressa Boykin whose telephone number is 571 272-1069. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30am to 3:00pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. The general information number for listings of personnel is ( 571-272-1700).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tmb

  
Examiner Terressa Boykin

TERRESSA M. BOYKIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER